UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,619	12/28/2001	Shell Sterling Simpson	10008213-1	3862

7590   03/29/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
GILLIS, BRIAN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/035,619	SIMPSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian Gillis	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 December 2001_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-35_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-35_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _28 December 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Levine et al (US Patent #6,020,973).

(Claim 1 discloses) a method for intelligently routing hard-copy generation tasks,

comprising the steps of: accessing imaging service data from a network connected

computing device (Levine et al shows a print server which retrieves data from a client

and then prints on a network printer (figure 5).); accessing imaging data from at least

one store via the network to generate at least one criterion (Levine et al shows a

document management subsystem which access data and can manage the processing

of the document (column 8, lines 57-59).); and presenting the means to access at least

one hard-copy generation service capable of performing a particular hard-copy

generation task matching the at least one criterion (Levine et al shows a user interface

is provided to provide user information (column 9, lines 48-50, figure 4)).

(Claim 14 discloses) a method for intelligently routing a task, comprising the

steps of: acquiring data regarding a plurality of services accessible to a network coupled

user-computing device (Levine et al shows a device data cache that holds information

of the connected devices (column 10, lines 38-49).); identifying a plurality of parameters

that define a task (Levine et al shows through the use of suitable software, output can

be provided in response to a group of user provided parameters (column 10, lines 4-

7).); identifying the capabilities of at least one resource associated with each of the

plurality of services (Levine et al shows the device data cache can hold various

information pertaining to the devices connected (column 10, lines 41-49).); associating

at least one decision point with each of the plurality of parameters (Levine et al shows a

data acquisition daemon that populates a database with the information (column 10,

lines 58-62).); and selectively adjusting the at least one decision point such that when

the system receives information reflective of data designated for a task, the decision

point is used in formulating a recommended resource to perform the task (Levine et al

shows a data acquisition daemon which can update data pertaining to a device (column

10, lines 62-63)).

(Claim 16 discloses) the method of claim 14, wherein the step of identifying a

plurality of parameters comprises resource control inputs (Levine et al shows of

resource control inputs (column 10, lines 43-44)).

(Claim 17 discloses) a system for recommending a network coupled resource,

comprising: means for developing a knowledge base concerning the capabilities of

available network coupled resources (Levine et al shows data acquisition daemons

collect information for a cache (column 10, lines 58-62).); means for associating at least one content descriptor with a designated task (Levine et al shows that the interface includes all of the hardware and software necessary to relate components of the controller with components of the network which inherently provides the association of a content descriptor with a task (column 7, lines 29-35).); means for developing logic responsive to the knowledge base (Levine et al shows that the interface includes all of the hardware and software necessary to relate components of the controller with components of the network which inherently provides logic in response to the knowledgebase (column 7, lines 29-35).); means for communicating the logic and the at least one descriptor to an application (Levine et al shows that the interface includes all of the hardware and software necessary to relate components of the controller with components of the network which inherently provides communication of the logic and descriptor to the application (column 7, lines 29-35).); means for extracting the at least one content descriptor from a document in a data store (Levine et al shows that the interface includes all of the hardware and software necessary to relate components of the controller with components of the network which inherently allows extraction of the descriptor from a document (column 7, lines 29-35).); and means for identifying a recommended network coupled resource suited to perform a designated data transformation (Levine et al shows that the interface includes all of the hardware and software necessary to relate components of the controller with components of the network which inherently allows a resource to perform a data transformation (column 7, lines 29-35).)

(Claim 18 discloses) the system of claim 17, wherein the knowledge base development means comprises information reflective of hard-copy generation services (Levine et al shows a device data cache which provides information about the connected devices (column 10, lines 42-49)).

(Claim 19 discloses) the system of claim 17, wherein the associating means comprises hard-copy generation device control inputs (Levine et al shows the data device cache contains information the controls the input to the device (column 10, lines 43-44)).

(Claim 20 discloses) the system of claim 17, wherein the communicating means comprises a network (Levine et al shows an interface that connects the device to a network (column 7, lines 30-31)).

Claims 24, 26, 28-30, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Duke et al (US Patent 6,573,910).

(Claim 24 discloses) a method for assisting a user in selecting a hardcopy generation service, comprising the steps of: accessing imaging data (Duke et al shows a customer submitting a document to a system which prints the document (column 4, lines 1-24).); formulating at least one criterion reflective of the imaging data (Duke et al shows the document has several attributes given by the system (column 4, lines 1-24).); accessing information reflective of a plurality of hardcopy generation services (Duke et al shows a remote processing equipment database is accessed which stores information about the devices connected (column 6, lines 61-67).); using the at least one criterion to identify hardcopy generation services (Duke et al shows the database is

provided information that can assist in determining where to send the document

(column 7, lines 10-12).); and presenting the identified hardcopy generation services to

the user (Duke et al shows a customer is presented with information and may change

the location where the document is being printed (column 11, lines 5-11)).

(Claim 26 discloses) the method of claim 24, further comprising: initiating a hard-

copy generation request (Duke et al shows a customer submits a document job to the

server for processing (column 4, lines 3-6)).

(Claim 28 discloses) the method of claim 24, wherein the step of accessing

information comprises network coupled hard-copy generation services (Duke et al

shows a system which has a server with a plurality of remote processing equipment

connected over a communication system (column 4, lines 1-3)).

(Claim 29 discloses) the method of claim 28, wherein the hard-copy generation

services are coupled via the wide area network commonly known as the Internet (Duke

et al shows the devices are connected of the Internet (column 4, lines 1-3)).

(Claim 30 discloses) the method of claim 28, wherein the hard-copy generation

services are coupled via a local area network (Duke et al shows the devices are

connected to a distributed communication system (column 4, lines 1-3)).

(Claim 34 discloses) the method of claim 26, further comprising: formulating a

second criterion responsive to a user preference (Duke et al shows a user is given

information pertaining to scheduling and routing which the user can provide preference

information about (column 11, lines 5-11)).

(Claim 35 discloses) the method of claim 34, further comprising: identifying at

least one recommended service responsive to the user preference (Duke et al shows

the customer is provided with information pertaining to scheduling and routing of

available devices able to process the document (column 11, lines 5-11)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Levine et al (US Patent #6,020,973) in view of Yeung et al (US PGPUB

#US2003/0093525).

Claim 2 discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the presenting step comprises

recommending at least one hard-copy generation service communicatively coupled via

the network. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of claim 1 as recited above (column

8, lines 57-59, column 9, line 48-50, figure 5). It fails to teach of recommending at least

on service, which is coupled via the network. Yeung et al teaches of having printers

recommended which are connected to a network (figure 1).

Levine et al and Yeung et al are analogous art because they are both related to

centralized print serving.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to use the recommending of network printers in Yeung et al with the

method in Levine et al because this method enables users to quickly store and retrieve documents from a central repository (Yeung et al, paragraph 79, lines 8-10).

Claim 8 discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of accessing imaging data comprises accessing imaging data through use of an imaging extension. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of claim 1 as recited above (column 8, lines 57-59, column 9, line 48-50, figure 5). It fails to teach of accessing data through an imaging extension. Yeung teaches of a print screen, which allows the user to see the data in the file before being processed (figure 20).

Levine et al and Yeung et al are analogous art because they are both related to centralized print serving.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the print screen in Yeung et al with the method in Levine et al because this enhances the user's experience by providing easy to use tools for locating, manipulating, and editing documents by one or multiple users (Yeung et al, paragraph 2, lines 3-6).

Claim 9 discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the step of recommending depends on both the imaging service and the imaging data. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of a method of routing print tasks as recited above (column 8, lines 57-59, column 9, lines 48-50, figure 5). It fails to teach of using both imaging service and imaging data to recommend the appropriate service. Yeung et al teaches of a document distribution model, which can sort, the files based on file format, which is part of the file data (figure 2).

Levine et al and Yeung et al are analogous art because they are both related to centralized print serving.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the document distribution model in Yeung et al with the method in Levine et al because a user is able to have jobs routed without having special skills in managing output devices (Yeung et al, paragraph 89, lines 7-8).

Claim 10 discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the step of recommending comprises presenting a plurality of user selectable destinations. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of a method of routing print tasks as recited above (column 8, lines 57-59, column 9, lines 48-50, figure 5). Yeung et al teaches of a print screen, which provides the user a list of selectable destinations (figure 20).

Levine et al and Yeung et al are analogous art because they are both related to centralized print serving.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the print screen in Yeung et al with the method in Levine et al because this enhances the user's experience by providing easy to use tools (Yeung et al, paragraph 2, lines 3-6).

Claim 11 discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the imaging extension comprises part of a user browser. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of a method of routing print tasks as recited above (column 8, lines 57-59, column 9, lines 48-50, figure 5). It fails to teach of an imaging extension comprising part of a user browser. Yeung et

al teaches of the use of the Windows Explorer tool, which is integrated into the user's

operating system and inherently the user's desktop (paragraph 2, lines 6-9).

Levine et al and Yeung et al are analogous art because they are both related to

centralized print serving.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to use the integration taught by Yeung et al with the method in Levine et al

because this provides a system such that a user is not required to navigate another

interface to access third party implementations (Yeung et al, paragraph 3, lines 1-5).

Claim 12 discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the imaging extension

comprises logic received from the imaging service data. Levine et al teaches of the

limitations of a method of routing print tasks as recited above (column 8, lines 57-59,

column 9, lines 48-50, figure 5). It fails to teach of the imaging extension comprising

logic from the imaging service data. Yeung et al teaches of a window, which displays

information about files in selected folders, which is pulled from the file itself (figure 18).

Levine et al and Yeung et al are analogous art because they are both related to

centralized print serving.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to use the file browser in Yeung et al with the method in Levine et al

because this enhances the user's experience by providing easy to use tools (Yeung et

al, paragraph 2, lines 3-6).

Claim 13 discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the step of recommending

further comprises presenting information describing the network location of each of the

plurality of user selectable destinations. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of a

method of routing print tasks as recited above (column 8, lines 57-59, column 9, lines

48-50, figure 5). It fails to teach of presenting information describing the network

location of each of the selectable printers. Yeung et al teaches of a print screen, which

shows a list of selectable printers and information about each printer (figure 20).

Levine et al and Yeung et al are analogous art because they are both related to

centralized print serving.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to use the print screen in Yeung et al with the method in Levine et al

because this enhances the user's experience by providing easy to use tools (paragraph

2, lines 3-6).

Claims 3, 4, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Levine et al (US Patent #6,020,973) in view of Aiello et al (US Patent

#6,337,745).

Claim 3 discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising: initiating a hard-copy

generation request. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of claim 1 as recited above

(column 8, lines 57-59, column 9, line 48-50, figure 5). It fails to teach of initiating a

hard-copy generation request. Aiello et al teaches of a graphical user interface which

an operator selects a job and directs the job to the printer (column 5, lines 46-47).

Levine et al and Aiello et al are analogous art because they are both related to

routing of print jobs.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the graphical user interface in Aiello et al with the method in Levine et al because the interface provides a flexible easy to use operator interface (Aiello et al, column 3, lines 19-20).

Claim 4 discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of accessing imaging service data comprises retrieving logic. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of claim 1 as recited above (column 8, lines 57-59, column 9, line 48-50, figure 5). It fails to teach of retrieving logic when accessing imaging service data. Aiello et al teaches of a queue manager, which accesses the job's header, information, which is data, connected to the file itself (column 5, lines 32-37).

Levine et al and Aiello et al are analogous art because they are both related to routing of print jobs.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the queue manager in Aiello et al with the method in Levine et al because this allows the system to determine which resources are required and determine if the required resources are available (Aiello et al, column 5, lines 34-37).

Claim 15 discloses the method of claim 14, wherein the step of acquiring data comprises services suited for performing at least one hard-copy generation task. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of claim 14 as recited above (column 10, lines 4-7, 38-49, 58-63). It fails to teach of acquiring services suited for performing a hard-copy generation task. Aiello et al teaches of a graphical user interface, which sends the job to the printer, which meets the needs of the job (column 5, lines 46-55).

Levine et al and Aiello et al are analogous art because they are both related to routing of print jobs.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the interface and queue manager in Aiello et al with the method in Levine et al because it permits efficient user of printer time and capabilities (Aiello et al, column 6, lines 51-56).

Claim 22 system of claim 17, wherein the identifying means comprises logic communicated to a browser. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of claim 17 as recited above (column 7, lines 29-35, column 10 lines 58-62). It fails to teach of the identifying means comprising logic communicated to a browser. Aiello et al teaches of a queue manager which accesses the file's header information which consists of logic and then communicates it to a graphical user interface which is part of the user's browser (column 5, lines 32-37).

Levine et al and Aiello et al are analogous art because they are both related to routing of print jobs.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the queue manager in Aiello et al with the method in Levine et al because allows the system to determine which resources are required and determine if the required resources are available (Aiello et al, column 5, lines 34-37).

Claims 5, 7, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine et al (US Patent #6,020,973) in view of Duke et al (US Patent #6,573,910).

Claim 5 discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of accessing imaging service data comprises retrieving content descriptors. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of claim 1 as recited above (column 8, lines 57-59, column 9, line 48-50, figure 5). It fails to teach of retrieving content descriptors when accessing imaging service data. Duke et al teaches of using job attributes, which can be a variety of descriptors of the contents of the file (column 4, lines 12-24).

Levine et al and Duke et al are analogous art because they are both related to print routing over a network.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the job attribute retrieval in Duke et al with the method in Levine et al because this allows the system how to distribute or deliver the job once printed (Duke et al, column 4, lines 22-23)

Claim 7 discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of accessing imaging data comprises retrieving a scaled-down version of a document. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of claim 1 as recited above (column 8, lines 57-59, column 9, line 48-50, figure 5). It fails to teach of retrieving a scaled-down version of a document. Duke et al teaches of providing visual images of the job for the customer to review (column 11, lines 37-39).

Levine et al and Duke et al are analogous art because they are both related to print routing over a network.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the visual images from Duke et al with the method in Levine et al

because this aids the customer in job verifications and proofing (Duke et al, column 11,

lines 35-36).

Claim 21 discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the extracting means

comprises an imaging extension. Levine et al teaches of the limitations of claim 17 as

recited above (column 7, lines 29-35, column 10 lines 58-62). It fails to teach of an

imaging extension. Duke et al teaches of a customer interface used for processing the

jobs (column 4, lines 24-35).

Levine et al and Duke et al are analogous art because they are both related to

print routing over a network.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to use the customer interface in Duke et al with the method in Levine et al

because this allows the customer to submit a job through an effective communication

process (Duke et al, column 4, lines 33-35).

Claim 23 discloses system of claim 21, wherein the imaging extension comprises

part of a browser. Levine teaches of a system for recommending a network-connected

resource (column 7, lines 29-35, column 10, lines 58-62). It fails to teach of an imaging

extension being part of a browser. Duke et al teaches of a customer interface, which is

connected, to a generic web browser (column 4, lines 30-35).

Levine et al and Duke et al are analogous art because they are both related to

print routing over a network.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to use the customer interface in Duke et al with the method in Levine et al

because this allows the customer to submit a job through an effective communication

process (Duke et al, column 4, lines 33-35).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine

(US Patent #6,020,973) in view of King (US Patent #6,529,286).

Claim 6 discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of accessing imaging

data comprises retrieving imaging data from the at least one store. Levine et al teaches

of the limitations of claim 1 as recited above (column 8, lines 57-59, column 9, line 48-

50, figure 5). It fails to teach of retrieving imaging data from at least one store. King

teaches of a fixed disk, which is accessed when data is to be retrieved (column 4, lines

1-4).

Levine et al and King are analogous art because they are both related to print

routing over a network.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to use the fixed disk in King with the method in Levine et al because a

computer is able to generate, manipulate, and store files to be processed (King, column

4, lines 2-3).

Claims 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Duke et al (US Patent #6,573,910 in view of King (US Patent #6,529,286).

Claim 25 discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the presenting step

comprises recommending at least one hard-copy generation service. Duke et al

teaches of the limitations of claim 24 as recited above (column 4, lines 1-24, column 6,

lines 61-67, column 11, lines 5-11). It fails to teach of recommending at least of hard-

copy generation service. King teaches of a preferred printing list, which recommends at least one printer to have the job printed to (column 5, lines 25-27).

Duke et al and King are analogous art because they are both related to print routing over a network.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the preferred print list in King with the method in Duke et al because resources in a network are efficiently used because the most suitable printer is chosen from the list (King, column 2, lines 46-48).

Claim 27 disclose the method of claim 24, wherein the step of accessing imaging data comprises data from a personal imaging repository. Duke et al teaches of the limitations of claim 24 as recited above (column 4, lines 1-24, column 6, lines 61-67, column 11, lines 5-11). It fails to teach of accessing data from a personal repository. King teaches of a fixed disk, which the data is retrieved from (column 4, lines 1-4).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the fixed disk in King with the method in Duke et al because a computer is able to generate, manipulate, and store files to be processed (King, column 4, lines 2-3).

Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duke et al (US Patent #6,573,910) in view of Mastie et al (US Patent #6,498,656).

Claim 31 discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the at least one criterion identifies a parameter range. Duke et al teaches of the limitations of claim 24 as recited above (column 4, lines 1-24, column 6, lines 61-67, column 11, lines 5-11). It fails to

teach of criterion identifying a parameter range. Mastie et al teaches of a criterion, which can consist of various parameters (column 6, lines 22-23).

Duke et al and Mastie et al are analogous art because they are both related to print routing over a network.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the criteria in Mastie et al with the method in Duke et al because the application of this criteria can return a set of available printers that can process the print job (Mastie et al, column 6, lines 27-28).

Claims 32 and 33 disclose the method of claim 31, wherein the parameter comprises a measure of the size of a document and a measure of color information. Duke et al teaches of a method for assisting a user in selecting a hardcopy generation service as recited above (column 4, lines 1-24, column 6, lines 61-67, column 11, lines 5-11). It fails to teach of criteria based on document size and color. Mastie et al teaches of a criterion, which can consist of various parameters including document size and color (column 6, lines 22-23).

Duke et al and Mastie et al are analogous art because they are both related to print routing over a network.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the criteria in Mastie et al with the method in Duke et al because the application of this criteria can return a set of available printers that can process the print job (Mastie et al, column 6, lines 27-28).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Levine et al (US Patent #5,974,234) teaches of a centralized print server. Leamy et al (US Patent #5,590,245) teaches of an image processing and routing method. Teng et al (US Patent #6,327,045) teaches of a computer network, which allows a client to submit data to have a job performed. Jebens et al (US Patent #6,321,231) teaches of a data management and order delivery system. Witek (US Patent #5,461,488) teaches of a computerized facsimile system. Leiman et al (PCT/US97/03334) teaches of open systems printing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Gillis whose telephone number is 571-272-7952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:45-4:15.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brian Gillis
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

BJG

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER